

Supplemental Online Content

Hwang U, Dresden SM, Vargas-Torres C, et al; Geriatric Emergency Department Innovations in Care Through Workforce, Informatics, and Structural Enhancement (GEDI WISE) Investigators. Association of a geriatric emergency department innovation program with cost outcomes among Medicare beneficiaries. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2021;4(3):e2037334. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.37334

eTable 1. Top 10 Interventions by the GEDI WISE Transitional Care Nurse or Social Worker

eTable 2. Sensitivity Analyses With Different TCN or SW Treatment

eTable 3. Sensitivity Analyses Excluding Beneficiaries That Subsequently Died After the Index ED Encounter

eTable 4. Entropy Balancing Weight Distribution

This supplemental material has been provided by the authors to give readers additional information about their work.

Supplement Table 1. Top 10 Interventions by the GEDI WISE Transitional Care Nurse or Social Worker^{3,4,10,11} :

1. Risk assessment for adverse outcomes from the ED.
2. Risk assessments for cognitive impairment and delirium.
3. Risk assessments and interventions to decrease falls and improve mobility, consult or refer to physical therapy when appropriate.
4. Functional assessments, consult or refer to occupational therapy when appropriate.
5. Evaluation of polypharmacy and potentially inappropriate medication use, consult ED pharmacist when appropriate.
6. Coordination for direct admission from ED to skilled nursing facilities or subacute rehabilitation.
7. Transportation coordination to and from ED to home.
8. Coordination of care transitions with outpatient evaluation and initiating referrals with home care agencies to ensure home safety for discharged patients.
9. Goals of care, advanced care planning discussions with palliative care.
10. Follow-up calls for discharged patients.

Supplement Table 2. Sensitivity analyses with different TCN or SW treatment

| Mount Sinai Medical Center, Period Jan 1, 2013 – Nov 30, 2016 | | | | | | |
|--|---|----------------------------|---------|---|----------------------------|---------|
| Treatment Group Average Incremental Effect (dollars per beneficiary) | GLM Gamma Log Model Average Treatment on the Treated Cost at 30 Day | 95% Confidence Interval | p-value | GLM Gamma Log Model Average Treatment on the Treated Cost at 60 Day | 95% Confidence Interval | p-value |
| | | | | | | |
| TCN-Only (n=9,312) | -3,606 | (-4,374 - -2,838) | <0.0001 | -3,224 | (-4,259 - -2,198) | <0.0001 |
| SW-Only (n=10,285) | -3,428 | (-4,151 - -2,724) | <0.0001 | -2,414 | (-3,416 - -1,412) | <0.0001 |
| BOTH TCN and SW (n=9,491) | -4,768 | (-5,528 - -4,008) | <0.0001 | -4,749 | (-5,751 - -3,748) | <0.0001 |

| Northwestern Memorial Hospital, Period April 1, 2013 – Nov 30, 2016 | | | | | | |
|---|---|-------------------------|---------|---|-------------------------------|---------|
| Treatment Group Average Incremental Effect (dollars per beneficiary) | GLM Gamma Log Model Average Treatment on the Treated Cost at 30 Day | 95% Confidence Interval | p-value | GLM Gamma Log Model Average Treatment on the Treated Cost at 60 Day | 95% Confidence Interval | p-value |
| TCN-Only (n=11,567) | -4,527 | (-5,073 - -3,981) | <0.0001 | -5,956 | (-6,725 - -5,187) | <0.0001 |
| SW-Only (n=10,916) | 1,808 | (1,153 - 2,463) | <0.0001 | 3,969 | (3,016 - 4,922) | <0.0001 |
| BOTH TCN and SW (11,820) | -2,105 | (-2,665 - -1,546) | <0.0001 | -2,871 | (-3,676 - -2,065) | <0.0001 |

Supplement Table 3. Sensitivity analyses excluding beneficiaries that subsequently died after the index ED encounter

| Treatment Group | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------|-------------------|---------|-------------------|-----------------|---------|
| TCN and/or SW | GLM | | | GLM | | |
| (excluding beneficiaries that subsequently died) | Gamma Log Model | | | Gamma Log Model | | |
| Average Incremental Effect | Average Treatment | | | Average Treatment | | |
| (dollars per beneficiary) | on the Treated | 95% Confidence | | on the Treated | 95% Confidence | |
| | Cost at 30 Day | Interval | p-value | Cost at 60 Day | Interval | p-value |
| Mount Sinai Medical Center | | | | | | |
| N=9,819 | -2,284 | (-3,347 – -1,321) | <0.0001 | -887 | (-2,157 – 774) | 0.23 |
| Northwestern Memorial Hospital | | | | | | |
| N=12,627 | -1,229 | (-1,857 – -601) | <0.0001 | -1,193 | (-2,074 – -290) | 0.01 |

Supplement Table 4. Entropy Balancing weight distribution

MSMC Weights summary distribution

if flag_np_sw == 0

entropy balancing weights

| ----- | | | | |
|-------|-------------|----------|-------------|----------|
| | Percentiles | Smallest | | |
| 1% | .0261485 | .0110613 | | |
| 5% | .0383897 | .013864 | | |
| 10% | .0484718 | .0148612 | Obs | 9,271 |
| 25% | .0748756 | .0153373 | Sum of Wgt. | 9,271 |
| 50% | .1289704 | | Mean | .2100097 |
| | | Largest | Std. Dev. | .4139873 |
| 75% | .2312786 | 9.063615 | | |
| 90% | .3990679 | 9.173126 | Variance | .1713855 |
| 95% | .5736017 | 10.67716 | Skewness | 16.53967 |
| 99% | 1.193698 | 16.55558 | Kurtosis | 434.4853 |

NMH Weights summary distribution

if flag_np_sw == 0

entropy balancing weights

| ----- | | | | |
|-------|-------------|----------|-------------|----------|
| | Percentiles | Smallest | | |
| 1% | .0072148 | .0034617 | | |
| 5% | .0114003 | .0041771 | | |
| 10% | .0158782 | .0043086 | Obs | 11,527 |
| 25% | .0303377 | .0044867 | Sum of Wgt. | 11,527 |
| 50% | .0649059 | | Mean | .1816604 |
| | | Largest | Std. Dev. | .3656353 |
| 75% | .157953 | 5.593703 | | |
| 90% | .4591565 | 6.527364 | Variance | .1336892 |
| 95% | .772007 | 6.571352 | Skewness | 6.04268 |
| 99% | 1.841251 | 6.945835 | Kurtosis | 62.60035 |